arXiv:cond-mat/0302218v3 [cond-mat.supr-con] 26 Nov 2004

Neither a type-I nor a type-II superconductivity in a two-gap system

Egor Babaev
Institute for Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University, Box 803, 75108 Uppsala, Sweden
Cornell University 620 Clark Hall Ithaca, NY 14853-2501 USA

We show that in two-gap Ginzburg-Landau model there is a wide range of parameters where behaviour of a superconductor in external field can not be classified nor as type-I nor as type-II. In this regime a superconductor features a nonmonotonic interaction between vortices (which is attractive at a certain large length scale and repulsive at a shorter length scale). This results in a first order transition into an inhomogeneous state of a mixture of vortex clusters where one of the order parameters is suppressed and domains of two-gap Meissner state.

Interaction of vortices is an interesting question even in the simplest one-component Ginzburg-Landau (GL) Model [1]. Its character in this model depends on the GL parameter $\kappa = \lambda/\xi$. In the type-II case (when $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$) the vortices repel each other. Another feature of the regime with $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$ is that a multiquanta vortex is unstable against decay into one-flux quanta vortices. An invasion of vortices in a type-II superconductor manifests itself as a second order transition at a critical value of applied field H_{c1}. In contrast, in the type-I case ($\kappa < 1/\sqrt{2}$) vortices attract each other. A system of two of these vortices is unstable against a collapse into a single two-quanta vortex. In the type-I regime a vortex can not form in an applied external field since it would require external field which exceeds thermodynamic critical magnetic field. However an isolated type-I vortex is stable. The type-I vortices were considered (along with type-II vortices) in cosmology [2], where they play important role and should be produced during a symmetry breaking phase transition in early universe [3]. The special case $\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}$ is also very interesting, in particular it was shown exactly that the vortices at this value of κ do not interact [4].

A general formula for interaction of two parallel vortices with a separation r is [5]

$$U(r) = c_1^2(\lambda,\xi)K_0\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right) - c_2^2(\lambda,\xi)K_0\left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}\xi}\right) \qquad (1)$$

where $K_0(r)$ is the Bessel function, $c_{1,2}(\lambda,\xi)$ are slow functions of the GL parameter, and $c_1(\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2}) = c_2(\kappa = 1/\sqrt{2})$. The first term in (1) is interaction due to particle currents. Indeed this interaction has the range of the London penetration λ. The second term is the attractive interaction due to overlap of cores.

However experiments [6] show that in certain materials with $\kappa \approx 1/\sqrt{2}$ vortices attract each other at a large scale and repel each other at a shorter distance. The nonmonotic interaction of vortices was reproduced in a modified one-gap GL functional with additional terms in the regime $\kappa \approx 1/\sqrt{2}$ [7, 8]. Besides that we should mention a nonmonotonic interaction which takes place in layered systems: there a van der Waals - type of attraction can be produced by thermal fluctions or disorder [9].

Below we consider a simplest two-gap model, without addition of the extra terms of the type discussed in context of single-gap model in [7, 8], and without restricting discussion to the case $\kappa \approx 1/\sqrt{2}$. We show that two-gap GL model allows a novel type of vortices (the "double-core" vortices) which have nonmonotonic interaction in a wide range of parameters as their intrinsic feature. The effective attraction of these vortices has a principally different nature comparing to the effects considered in [7, 8, 9]. Moreover, we show that two-gap superconductors under certain conditions display even more exotic magnetic properties which have no counterparts in single-gap systems.

The two-gap superconductor [10, 11] (known in particle physics as a two-Higgs doublet model [12]) in the simplest case can be described by the following GL functional:

$$F = \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_1}\left|\left(\nabla + i\frac{2e}{\hbar c}\mathbf{A}\right)\Psi_1\right|^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{4m_2}\left|\left(\nabla + i\frac{2e}{\hbar c}\mathbf{A}\right)\Psi_2\right|^2$$
$$+V(|\Psi_{1,2}|^2) + \eta[\Psi_1^*\Psi_2 + \Psi_2^*\Psi_1] + \frac{\mathbf{H}^2}{8\pi} \qquad (2)$$

where $\Psi_\alpha = |\Psi_\alpha|e^{i\phi_\alpha}$ and $V(|\Psi_{1,2}|^2) = \sum_{\alpha=1,2} -b_\alpha|\Psi_\alpha|^2 + \frac{c_\alpha}{2}|\Psi_\alpha|^4$ and η is a characteristic of the interband Josephson coupling strength [11].

Recently two-gap superconductivity was observed in in MgB_2 [13] and in $NbSe_2$ [14]. Two-gap models appear also in the theoretical studies of liquid metallic hydrogen, which should allow superconductivity of both electronic and protonic Cooper pairs [15], while in liquid metallic deuterium a deuteron superfluidity may coexist with electronic superconductivity [15]. Besides that in superconductors there could coexist two types of pairing (e.g. s- and p-wave condensates).

One can rearrange variables in (2) as follows [16, 17,

18]:

$$F = \frac{\hbar^2}{4}\frac{\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}}{\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}}(\nabla(\phi_1-\phi_2))^2 + \frac{4\hbar^2}{\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}}\times \left\{\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{4m_1}\nabla\phi_1 + \frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{4m_2}\nabla\phi_2 - \frac{2e}{c}\mathbf{A}\right\}^2 + \frac{\mathbf{H}^2}{8\pi} + 2\eta|\Psi_1\Psi_2|\cos(\phi_1-\phi_2) + V(|\Psi_{1,2}|^2) \quad (3)$$

Let us consider first the case $\eta = 0$. The first term features a gauge invariant phase difference $\gamma_n = \phi_1 - \phi_2$. Since no coupling to gauge field enters this term, then any vortex with nontrivial winding number of γ_n has divergent energy per unit length [17]. In this paper we consider only vortices with finite energy per unit length. These are the vortices with phase windings satisfying the condition $\Delta\gamma_n \equiv \Delta(\phi_1 - \phi_2) = 0$ where $\Delta\gamma_n$ denotes the gain in the phase γ_n when we go around a vortex core. In the case of nonzero η, one can observe that, when $\eta > 0$ the free energy (3) is minimized by $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = \pi$, while when $\eta < 0$ we have $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = 0$. Thus when one considers topological defects with $\Delta\gamma_n = 0$ the fourth term in (3) is phase-independent and can be absorbed in the potential term. In this paper we want to discuss magnetic properties of two gap system in the simplest and most transparent case and for this reason we put $\eta = 0$. As discussed above the low-temperature magnetic properties of the cases of zero and nonzero η are essentially the same since in both cases only the vortices characterized by $\Delta\gamma_n = 0$ have finite energy. An extension to a nonzero η as well as to an addition of terms proportional to $|\Psi_1|^2|\Psi_2|^2$ is trivial. So for the case when $\Delta\gamma_n = 0$, the remaining nontrivial terms in GL functional are:

$$F^{\gamma_n=const} = \frac{4\hbar^2}{\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}}\left\{\left(\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{4m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{4m_2}\right)\nabla\gamma_c - \frac{2e}{c}\mathbf{A}\right\}^2 + \frac{\mathbf{H}^2}{8\pi} - b_1|\Psi_1|^2 + \frac{c_1}{2}|\Psi_1|^4 - b_2|\Psi_2|^2 + \frac{c_2}{2}|\Psi_2|^4 \quad (4)$$

where $\gamma_c = (\phi_1 + \phi_2)$ The equation for supercurrent for (4) is (see e.g. [16, 17, 18])

$$\mathbf{J} = \frac{i\hbar e}{2m_1}\{\Psi_1^*\nabla\Psi_1 - \Psi_1\nabla\Psi_1^*\} + \frac{i\hbar e}{2m_2}\{\Psi_2^*\nabla\Psi_2 - \Psi_2\nabla\Psi_2^*\} - \frac{2e^2}{c}\left(\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}\right)\mathbf{A}. \quad (5)$$

As it was shown in [17], in this model, the vortices characterized by the following phase gains: $\Delta\gamma_n = 0; \Delta\gamma_c = 4\pi k$ carry k-quanta of magnetic flux.

The model (4) possesses three characteristic length scales: two coherence lengths $\xi_\alpha = \hbar/\sqrt{4m_\alpha b_\alpha}$ determined by the effective potential and the magnetic field penetration length:

$$\lambda = \frac{c}{\sqrt{8\pi}e}\left[\frac{|\Psi_1|^2}{m_1}+\frac{|\Psi_2|^2}{m_2}\right]^{-1/2}. \quad (6)$$

Let also introduce a notation $\lambda_\alpha = c\sqrt{m_\alpha}/(\sqrt{8\pi}e|\Psi_\alpha|)$ Below we also use notations for thermonynamic critical magnetic fields for *individual* condensates $H_{ct(\alpha)} = \Phi_0/(2\sqrt{2}\pi\xi_\alpha\lambda_\alpha)$. In discussion when the individual condensate Ψ_1 is of type-II we denote the first and the second critical magnetic of isolated Ψ_1 as follows: $H_{c1(1)} = \Phi_0/(4\pi\lambda_1^2)[\log(\lambda_1/\xi_1) + 0.08]$ and $H_{c2(1)} = \Phi_0/(2\pi\xi_1^2)$.

Apparently in the cases when $\xi_1 \approx \xi_2 >> \lambda$ and when $\xi_1 \approx \xi_2 << \lambda$, magnetic properties of the two-gap superconductor parallel those of single-gap type-I and type-II superconductors correspondingly. However in a general case, when one of the condensates is of type I and another is of type II, a two-gap system in exernal field has much richer phase diagram and allows many types of different transitions in external field.

In the case when $\xi_1 << \lambda_1$ and $\xi_2 >> \lambda_2$, and when thermodynamic critical magnetic field $H_{ct(2)}$ for the type-I condensate Ψ_2 is much higher than $H_{c2(1)}$ for the type-II condensate Ψ_1, the system undergoes a first order transition from a normal state immediately into a two-gap superconducting state. This is because, in this case, at fields higher than $H_{ct(2)}$ the system does not allow nontrivial solution of the linearized GL equation for Ψ_1, while, when the field is lowered below $H_{ct(2)}$, there appears a transition immediately into two-gap superconducting state. In this state the magnetic field is screened in bulk of a sample largely due to surface current Ψ_2 and nothing can preclude the appearance of the second condensate Ψ_1 in the bulk of the sample even if the applied field is much larger than $H_{c2(1)}$.

Consider now the case when $\lambda_1/\xi_1 > 1/\sqrt{2}; \lambda_2/\xi_2 > 1/\sqrt{2}; \xi_1 << \xi_2; \lambda = (1/\lambda_1^2 + 1/\lambda_2^2)^{-1/2} < \xi_2/\sqrt{2}$. In this case we have a two-gap system made up of two type-II condensates, however, somewhat counterintutively, the magnetic properties of this system are principally different from a type-II superconductor. One can observe that the resulting penetration length in this system can be smaller than one of the coherence lengths $\lambda < \xi_2/\sqrt{2}$, since both condensates contribute to λ, so a vortex in this system will consist of an inner core of characteristic size ξ_1, a flux tube of size λ, and an extended "outer" core of a characteristic size of ξ_2 larger than λ [19]. It means that, albeit at length scales smaller than λ the interaction of two vortices is repulsive, at the same time the extended core gives to such a vortex an effective attraction $U \propto K_0(r/\sqrt{2}\xi_2)$ for $r > \lambda$ in a range of $\sqrt{2}\xi$. Thus in contrast to an ordinary type-II superconductor, there exists a range of parameters where the phase transition at H_{c1} in this system is of the first order. This is because due to attractive interaction the energy of a lattice made up of n vortices (with the lattice spacing de-

termined by the minimum of the nonmonotonic interaction potential) has lower energy than n isolated vortices. Correspondingly the magnetization of such a superconductor should change abruptly by a formation of a vortex lattice, instead of a gradual invasion of isolated vortices. Also for the same reason in a decreasing applied field the vortex lattice should survive even in fields lower than the critical field where a formation of an isolated vortex becomes energetically favored. Another consequence of the effective attraction between vortices is that at a given low vortex density, when average distance between the vortices is larger than the distance determined by the minimum of the effective potential, the vortices will spontaneously form lattice clusters in between areas of vortex-free Meissner state.

Let us now turn to the case when $\lambda_1/\xi_1 > 1/\sqrt{2}; \lambda_2/\xi_2 < 1/\sqrt{2}; \xi_2 > \lambda$. Let us consider a vortex in this case. For a two-gap superconductor, vortex energy consists of energies of cores, kinetic energy of Meissner current and magnetic field energy. The magnetic field energy and the kinetic energy of the screening current is given by the standard expression: $F_m = (1/8\pi)\int d^3x \mathbf{H}^2 + (1/8\pi)\int d^3x \lambda^2_{eff}(\mathrm{curl}\mathbf{H})^2$. Here we note that in the present case $|\Psi_2(\mathbf{x})|^2$ varies slowly over the London penetration length λ. Magnetic field is screened at a distance from the core which is smaller than ξ_2. That means that only depleted density of Cooper pairs of condensate Ψ_2 participates in the screening of magnetic field. Thus one can not use the London penetration length λ but should introduce an effective penetration length $\lambda_{eff} = [1/\lambda_1^2 + 1/\tilde{\lambda}_2^2(\mathbf{x})]^{-1/2}$ where $\tilde{\lambda}_2(\mathbf{x}) = c\sqrt{m_2}/(\sqrt{8\pi}e|\Psi_2(\mathbf{x})|) > \lambda_2 = c\sqrt{m_2}/(\sqrt{8\pi}e|\bar{\Psi}_2|)$, where $|\bar{\Psi}_2|$ is the average value of the order parameter modulus. In the case when $\lambda_1 << \xi_2$, we have $\lambda_{eff} \approx \lambda_1$ which corresponds to the situation when magnetic field is screened mostly by condensate Ψ_1. On the other hand in the case when $\xi_2 >> \lambda_1 >> \lambda_2 >> \xi_1$ the magnetic field is screened at a chracteristic length scale of Pippard penetration length $\lambda = \lambda_2^P \approx (\lambda_2^2\xi_2)^{1/3}$ of the condensate Ψ_2.This expression is valid when $\lambda_2^P < \lambda_1$. In the above expression for F_m we cut off integrals at the distance ξ_1 from the center of the core in order to obtain an estimate of the vortex energy which has a logarithmic accuracy. With it the energy per unit length of a one-flux-quanta vortex is

$$\mathcal{E} \approx \left(\frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi\lambda_{eff}}\right)^2 \log\frac{\lambda_{eff}}{\xi_1} + \mathcal{V}_{c1} + \mathcal{V}_{c2} \qquad (7)$$

Where $\mathcal{V}_{c\alpha}$ are the energies of the cores per unit length which are of order of magnitude of [*core size*] $\times$ [*condensation energy*]. The estimate of the core energy can also be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{V}_{c\alpha} \approx \frac{\pi\xi_\alpha^2 H_{ct(\alpha)}^2}{8\pi} = \frac{\Phi_0^2}{8\pi}\frac{e^2|\Psi_\alpha|^2}{c^2 m_\alpha} = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha^2} \qquad (8)$$

Apparently $\mathcal{V}_{c1} + \mathcal{V}_{c2} \approx (\Phi_0/8\pi\lambda)^2$.

A straightforward calculation of the field H_{c1}^0 characterizing when it is becoming energetically preferred to let into a superconductor a *single* vortex gives:

$$H_{c1}^0 \approx \frac{\Phi_0}{4\pi}\left[\frac{1}{\lambda_{eff}^2}\log\frac{\lambda_{eff}}{\xi_1}\right] + \frac{\Phi_0}{16\pi}\left[\frac{1}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2^2}\right] \qquad (9)$$

The transition into mixed state should be of the first order since the extended core at length scale $\xi_2 > \lambda_{eff}$ gives rise to attractive interaction of vortices so, a lattice of vortices with a spacing determined by the minimum of the interaction potential is preferred over a system of widely separated vortices. That is, the energy of a system of n vortices is minimized when vortices spontaneously form a lattice cluster with overlapping outer cores. We should observe that H_{c1}^0 in the present situation is larger than thermodynamic critical magnetic field of the type-I condensate which is $H_{ct(2)} = \Phi_0/(2\sqrt{2}\pi\xi_2\lambda_2)$. We stress that this however does not mean that at the field (9) the condensate Ψ_2 is completely depleted due to overlapping of outer cores. It is because when the applied field is close to H_{c1}^0, then the field is mostly screened by a supercurrent of the condensate Ψ_1, which circulates along sample's edge. Thus the vortex system is dilute, or more precisely the intervortex distance is only determined by the effective attraction. So in contrast to original type-I and type-II behavior, the two-gap superconductor in this regime displays a first order transition into an inhomogeneous state consisting of clusters of vortices, where the order parameter Ψ_2 is depleted due to overlaps of outer cores. So the superconductivity in these vortex lattice "droplets" is dominated by the order parameter Ψ_1 and is essentially a one-gap superconductivity. Since the vortex density depends on applied field while the intervortex distance is determined by the nonmonotonic interaction potential, so, besides these clusters of vortices, there should be present domains of two-gap superconductivity in the vortexless Meissner state.

One of the possible direction where this work can be extended is the interesting question for a numerical study if there is a range of parameters when a triangular lattice is not the most energetically preferred. Indeed, for a given density of vortices, at a certain applied field, spacing of a square lattice may be closer to length scale given by minimum of vortex interaction potential, than spacing of a triangular lattice. However, in a triangular lattice, albeit the intervortex distance is larger, there are six instead of four nearest neighbors. Apparently in sufficiently strong magnetic fields the effective attraction at large length scale is irrelevant and vortices form a standard triangular lattice. So this system may allow transitions between lattices with different symmetries, when applyed magnetic field is varied.

We also would like to note that in the recent experiment on MgB_2 [20] (which is the strictly type-II two-gap

superconductor) indicates a large disparity in coherence lengths. The coherence length in π-band was found being $\sim$50nm which is much larger than an estimate which one would obtain from a standard GL formula for a one-gap superconductor using the H_{c2} value of MgB_2. Such a behavior is completely in agreement with the model for the composite two-gap vortex [17].

In conclusion we discussed magnetic properties of a simplest form of a two-gap GL model. We have shown that the model exhibits behavior which has no counterpart in a standard one-gap superconductors. The discussed features do not allow to classify the two-band superconductor in the considered regimes as type-II and indeed nor as type-I but it should legitimately be distinguished in a separate class.

Note added A more detailed and quantitative study of the question which we discuss in this article can be found in E. Babaev, J.M. Speight `cond-mat/0411681`

[1] A.A. Abrikosov Sov. Phys. JETP **5** 1174 (1957). This concept was introduced in high energy physics in H. B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B **61**, 45 (1973).

[2] M. B. Hindmarsh and T. W. Kibble, Rept. Prog. Phys. **58**, 477 (1995)

[3] T. W. Kibble, J. Phys. A **9**, 1387 (1976).

[4] E. B. Bogomolny, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 449 (1976) L. Jacobs, C. Rebbi Phys. Rev. B **19** 4486 (1979).

[5] L. Kramer Phys. Rev.B **3**, 3821 (1971).

[6] R. P. Hübener *Magnetic Flux Structures in Superconductors* Springer, Berlin (1979); U. Krägeloh Phys. Status. Solidi **42**, 559 (1970).

[7] A. E. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 3022 (1971), A. E. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 3029 (1971); A. Hubert Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) **53** 147 (1972); E.H. Brandt *ibid* **77**105 (1976); I. Luk'yanchuk Phys. Rev. B**63**, 174504 (2001).

[8] F. Mohamed, I. Luk'yanchuk, M. Troyer, G. Blatter Phys. Rev. B **65** 224504 (2002).

[9] G. Blatter and V.B. Geshkenbein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4958 (1996). S. Mukherji and T. Nattermann, *ibid* **79**, 139 (1997).

[10] H. Suhl, B.T. Matthias, L.R. Walker, Phys.Rev.Lett.**3**, 552 (1959)

[11] A.J. Leggett, Prog. of Theor.Phys. **36**, 901 (1966)

[12] T.D. Lee, Phys.Rev. D **8** 1226, (1973)

[13] see e.g. F. Bouquet *et. al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 047001 (2001) Amy Y. Liu *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 087005 (2001) P. Szabo *et. al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 137005 (2001)

[14] T. Yokoya *et. al.* Science **294** 2518 (2001)

[15] K. Moulopoulos and N. W. Ashcroft Phys. Rev. B **59** 12309 (1999); J. Oliva and N. W. Ashcroft Phys. Rev. B **30** 1326 (1984); N. W. Ashcroft J. Phys. **A129** 12 (2000).

[16] E. Babaev, L. D. Faddeev and A. J. Niemi, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 100512 (2002) Similar consideration were found being relevant for spin-triplet superconductors E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 177002 (2002)

[17] E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067001 (2002)

[18] E.Babaev cond-mat/0201547

[19] In fact the actual penetration length will be larger than the London penetration length λ since it will receive a correction due to depletion of $|\Psi_2|$ at a distance smaller than ξ_2 from the core. The effective penetration length λ_{eff} in this vortex, depending on the GL parameters, will have the range $\lambda < \lambda_{eff} < \lambda_1 < \xi_2$

[20] M. R. Eskildsen *et. al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 187003 (2002)